		DAY OF
		DONNA MAPRALIZY 2022
1	Michael Willis of the Chase Family, In Propria Persona	Clerk of Superior Court By: AK BALL
2	P.O. Box 4461,	Deputy Deputy
3	CITY OF SEDONA,	RECEIVED
4	STATE OF ARIZONA U.S.A. [86340 Email: aloha777sedona@gmail.com	APR 1 2 2022
5	Phone: +1 (928) 399-9688	
		YAVAPAI COUNTY ATTORNEY
6	IN THE SUPERIOR	R COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA
7		OR THE COUNTY OF YAVAPAI
8		
9	STATE OF ARIZONA) CASE NO. V1300CR201980661
10	PLAINTIFF) FOR THE RECORD: DECLARED WITNESSED
11	VS.) TESTIMONY OF <i>MICHAEL WILLIS</i> OF THE) CHASE FAMILY. NOTICE OF PAYMENT OF
0.000	V 3.) COURT ORDER OF COMMISSIONER JOHN D
12	Michael Willis of the Chase) NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER 839377707
13	Family, Principle Creditor For) ACCORDING TO THE COINAGE ACT OF
14	MICHAEL WILLIS CHASE™	, , ,
15	A COLUCED) JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER
13	ACCUSED) 839377707 OATH OF STATE
16) AND FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONS OF) ARTICLE I, SECTION 10, CLAUSE I."
17		JARTICLE I, SECTION 10, CLAUSE 1.
18 19	Dated this 11 th day of April, 20	22.
20	Michael Willis of the Cha	se Family. 18 U.S. Code § 4 - Misprision of felony
21	"FOR THE RECORD:	DECLARED WITNESSED TESTIMONY OF
22		E CHASE FAMILY. NOTICE OF PAYMENT OF
	COURT ORDER OF C	OMMISSIONER JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S
23	NUMBER 839377707 ACC	ORDING TO THE COINAGE ACT OF APRIL 2,
24	1792, AND COMMISS.	IONER JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER
25		
26	Michael Willis of the Chase family –	"FOR THE RECORD: DECLARED WITNESSED TESTIMONY
27	OF MICHAEL WILLIS OF THE CH. COMMISSIONER JOHN D. NA	ASE FAMILY. NOTICE OF PAYMENT OF COURT ORDER OF APPER D-U-N-S NUMBER 839377707 ACCORDING TO THE
28	COINAGE ACT OF APRIL 2, 1792	, AND COMMISSIONER JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER ND FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONS ARTICLE I, SECTION 10,
	65557707 OATH OF STATE A	CLAUSE I."
		PAGE 1 OF 36

ORIGINAL FILED THIS

839377707 OATH OF STATE AND FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONS ARTICLE I, **SECTION 10, CLAUSE I."**

To COMMISSIONER JOHN D. NAPPER By Asseveration.

¶1. Regarding: The Accused *Michael Willis* of the Chase Family (hereinafter Declarant) "FOR THE RECORD: DECLARED WITNESSED TESTIMONY OF MICHAEL WILLIS OF THE CHASE FAMILY. NOTICE OF PAYMENT OF COURT ORDER OF COMMISSIONER JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER 839377707 ACCORDING TO THE COINAGE ACT OF APRIL 2, 1792. AND COMMISSIONER JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER 839377707 OATH OF STATE AND FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONS ARTICLE I, **SECTION 10, CLAUSE I."**

Notice

- ¶2. Notice Is Hereby Given that I, *Michael Willis* of the Chase Family, The Declarant has undergone a religious conversion to a Denizen¹, I do not take oaths, or affirmations. Gordon versus Idaho 778 F.2d 1397 (1985), [The United States Ninth Circuit Judge Harry Pregerson.] Psalm 116:11 and Romans 3:4.
- ¶3. Notice Is Hereby Given that the "FOR THE RECORD: DECLARED WITNESSED TESTIMONY OF MICHAEL WILLIS OF THE CHASE **OF** NOTICE **OF PAYMENT OF** COURT ORDER FAMILY.

Denizen Definition: Sir Walter Scott "Denizens of their own free, independent state" 1912. William Blackstone, Commentaries on the Laws of England, Book 1, Chapter X, p. 374 "A denizen is a kind of middle state, between an alien and a natural-born subject, and partakes of both." 1765. Gordon versus Idaho 778 F.2d 1397 (1985), -The United States Ninth Circuit Judge Harry Pregerson. "I'm simply saying that since we've all lied in the past and we've lied once or twice today and we're going to lie in the future, why kid ourselves by saying we tell the truth when in fact we do not. It's my position I would be guilty of perjury the moment I said 'Do you swear to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth so help you God' and I say 'I do' I'm committing a lie." -George Gordon. Psalm 116:11 "I said in my haste, all people are liars" Romans 3:4 "May it never be! Yes, let God be found true, but every man a liar. As it is written"

Michael Willis of the Chase family - "FOR THE RECORD: DECLARED WITNESSED TESTIMONY OF MICHAEL WILLIS OF THE CHASE FAMILY. NOTICE OF PAYMENT OF COURT ORDER OF COMMISSIONER JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER 839377707 ACCORDING TO THE COINAGE ACT OF APRIL 2, 1792, AND COMMISSIONER JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER 839377707 OATH OF STATE AND FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONS ARTICLE I, SECTION 10, **CLAUSE I."**

PAGE 2 OF 36

27 28

22

23

24

25

26

COMMISSIONER JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER 839377707 ACCORDING TO THE COINAGE ACT OF APRIL 2, 1792, AND COMMISSIONER JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER 839377707 OATH OF STATE AND FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONS ARTICLE I, SECTION 10, CLAUSE I." is declared witnessed solemn testimony of *Michael Willis* of the Chase Family by asseveration. Asseveration being the proof which *Michael Willis* of the Chase Family gives of the facts of what he says, by appealing to his conscience as a witness. It differs from an oath in this, that by the oath one appeals to *Yahweh* as a witness of the facts of what he says, and invokes *Yahweh* as the avenger of falsehood and perfidy (treachery or deceit), to punish him, by the courts, if he speak not the truth, which is a set up for perjury, because all men are liars. This is commonly known as an "oath of purgation" that was used in the Dark Ages to slaughter Pagans.

¶4. Notice Is Hereby Given that, this declared witnessed solemn testimony of *Michael Willis* of the Chase Family by asseveration. Know all these presents that Declarant, *Michael Willis* of the Chase Family does state the following: THAT *Michael Willis* of the Chase Family has personal knowledge of the facts stated herein. THAT *Michael Willis* of the Chase Family is competent to state to the matters set forth herein. THAT all the facts stated herein are correct and certain to the best of *Michael Willis* of the Chase Family knowledge, are admissible as evidence, and if called upon as a witnesses, *Michael Willis* of the Chase Family will testify to their veracity. THAT *Michael Willis* of the Chase Family states the following facts;

<u>Constitution of "The State of Arizona" – 1912.</u> <u>ARTICLE VI. JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT</u>

Michael Willis of the Chase family – "FOR THE RECORD: DECLARED WITNESSED TESTIMONY OF MICHAEL WILLIS OF THE CHASE FAMILY. NOTICE OF PAYMENT OF COURT ORDER OF COMMISSIONER JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER 839377707 ACCORDING TO THE COINAGE ACT OF APRIL 2, 1792, AND COMMISSIONER JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER 839377707 OATH OF STATE AND FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONS ARTICLE I, SECTION 10, CLAUSE I."

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

¶5. "§25. Style of process; conduct of prosecutions in name of state. Section 25. The style of process shall be The State of Arizona, and prosecutions shall be conducted in the name of the State and by its authority." unquote.

Introduction.

¶6. COMES NOW, *Michael Willis* of the Chase Family, the Declarant in the above entitled and numbered cause, and respectfully **DEMANDS** this Court to enter this Document on the recored, and MUST enter this April 11th 2022 Document "FOR THE RECORD: DECLARED WITNESSED TESTIMONY OF MICHAEL WILLIS OF THE CHASE FAMILY. NOTICE OF PAYMENT OF COURT ORDER OF COMMISSIONER JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER 839377707 ACCORDING TO THE COINAGE ACT OF APRIL 2, 1792, AND COMMISSIONER JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER 839377707 OATH OF STATE AND FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONS ARTICLE I, SECTION 10, CLAUSE I." on the record of CASE NO. V1300CR201980661, COMMISSIONER JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER 839377707 violations of his "oath of office" filed at the Secretary of State of Arizona records department to the Federal and State Constitutions. [See Exhibit A - HowardFreeman/UCC-Connection. Exhibit B - The Miracle on Main Street, Exhibit C - Silent Weapons For Quiet Wars. Exhibit D - US Mint; Silver Dollar \$85, Exhibit E -Yavapai/Prescott Clerk Receipt]

¶7. This Declarant claims and demands all Rights under *Yahweh* Holy Scriptural Law, The Law of Nations, The Constitution of the United States, The Constitution of

Michael Willis of the Chase family – "FOR THE RECORD: DECLARED WITNESSED TESTIMONY OF MICHAEL WILLIS OF THE CHASE FAMILY. NOTICE OF PAYMENT OF COURT ORDER OF COMMISSIONER JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER 839377707 ACCORDING TO THE COINAGE ACT OF APRIL 2, 1792, AND COMMISSIONER JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER 839377707 OATH OF STATE AND FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONS ARTICLE I, SECTION 10,

1	The State of Arizona, and the substantive The Common Law at all times, never
2	waiving any rights.
3	Payment of Fines, Fees and Costs
4	
5 6	¶8. For the record, in this case we had a major lack of due process and we have numerous intentional constitutional tortious (sic) effects done in this action. Many tortions
7	acts.
8	[See: HowardFreeman/UCC-Connection. Exhibit A].
9 10	¶9. First of all the problem had arisen was <u>nexus</u> of the contract.
11	¶10. <u>Secondly</u> , if the court is demanding <u>payment</u> of fines, fees and costs in dollars that is the economy of Roger Sherman, which has <u>not</u> been dealt in for years, which is
12 13	constitutional according to Article I Section 10's most salient part, which states:
14	"No state shall make any thing but gold and silver coin a tender in payment of debts."
15 16	[See: The Miracle on Main Street. Exhibit B].
17 18	¶11. If the fines, fees and costs have to be paid in dollars, gold and silver, then we have a problem with <i>parity</i> . The U.S. Mint says the silver dollar is seventy Federal Reserve note artificial paper money dollars to one silver dollar.
19 20	¶12. The monetary system at this point in time is <u>arbitrary</u> , <u>artificial money</u> , which is strictly forbidden to any public servant according to <i>Article I Section 10</i> of the federal
21 22	Constitution. This Accused would be assisting in a declaration of war in the top secret. Silent Weapons for Quiet Wars, document, which is a destructive mechanism for
23	overthrow of Article I Section 10, and a criminally psychotic writing. And it is an actual document, checked out by the military. It is part of United States Code Title 50,
24	the War Powers Act.
25	
26	Michael Willis of the Chase family – "FOR THE RECORD: DECLARED WITNESSED TESTIMONY OF MICHAEL WILLIS OF THE CHASE FAMILY. NOTICE OF PAYMENT OF COURT ORDER OF
27 28	COMMISSIONER JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER 839377707 ACCORDING TO THE COINAGE ACT OF APRIL 2, 1792, AND COMMISSIONER JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER 839377707 OATH OF STATE AND FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONS ARTICLE I, SECTION 10,

CLAUSE I." PAGE 5 OF 36

28

¶18. Therefore, this Accused is *not* refusing to obey a lawful order of the Court to pay fines, fees and costs at face value of money of account according to Article I Michael Willis of the Chase family - "FOR THE RECORD: DECLARED WITNESSED TESTIMONY OF MICHAEL WILLIS OF THE CHASE FAMILY. NOTICE OF PAYMENT OF COURT ORDER OF COMMISSIONER JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER 839377707 ACCORDING TO THE COINAGE ACT OF APRIL 2, 1792, AND COMMISSIONER JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER 839377707 OATH OF STATE AND FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONS ARTICLE I, SECTION 10, **CLAUSE I."** PAGE 6 OF 36

28

1990-HowardFreeman/UCC-Connection

FOREWORD

- ¶19. This is slightly condensed, casually paraphrased transcript of tapes of a seminar given in 1990 by Howard Freeman. It was prepared to make available the knowledge and experience of Mr. Freeman in his search for an accessible and understandable explanation of the confusing state of the government and the courts. It should be helpful to those who may have difficulty learning from such lectures, or those who want to develop a deeper understanding of this information without having to listen to three or four hours of recorded material.
- ¶20. The frustration many Americans feel about our judicial system can be overwhelming and often frightening; and like most fear, eventually, with the seemingly tyrannical power of some *governmental agency* and the mystifying and awesome power of the courts. We have been taught that we *must* "*get a good lawyer*," but that is becoming increasingly difficult, if not impossible. If we are defending ourselves from the government, we find that the lawyers quickly take our money, and then tell us as the ship is sinking, "*I cannot help you with that I am an officer of the court.*"
- ¶21. Ultimately, the only way for us to have even a "snowball's chance ..." is to understand the RULES OF THE GAME, and to come to an understanding of the true nature of the Law. The attorney lawyers have established and secured a virtual monopoly over this area of human knowledge by implying that the subject is just too difficult for the average person to understand, and by creating a separate vocabulary out of English words of otherwise common usage. While it may, at times, seem hopelessly complicated, it is not that difficult to grasp are lawyers really as smart as they would have us believe? BESIDES, ANYONE WHO HAS BEEN THROUGH A LEGAL BATTLE AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT WITH THE AID OF A LAWYER HAS COME TO REALIZE THAT LAWYERS LEARN ABOUT PROCEDURE, NOT ABOUT LAW. Mr. Freeman admits that he is not a lawyer, and as much, he has a way of explaining law to us that puts it well within our reach. Consider also that the framers of the Constitution wrote in language simple enough that the people could understand, specifically so that it

Michael Willis of the Chase family – "FOR THE RECORD: DECLARED WITNESSED TESTIMONY OF MICHAEL WILLIS OF THE CHASE FAMILY. NOTICE OF PAYMENT OF COURT ORDER OF COMMISSIONER JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER 839377707 ACCORDING TO THE COINAGE ACT OF APRIL 2, 1792, AND COMMISSIONER JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER 839377707 OATH OF STATE AND FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONS ARTICLE I, SECTION 10, CLAUSE I."

839377707 OATH OF STATE AND FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONS ARTICLE I, SECTION 10, CLAUSE I." PAGE 8 OF 36

1 2	the United States Supreme Court. You sat on the bench while I read that case law. Now how do you, a District Judge, have authority to
3	overturn decisions of the Supreme Court?"
4	He says.
5	"Oh, those were old decisions."
6	I said,
7	
8 9	"Those are standing decisions. They have never been overturned. I don't care how old they are; you have no right to overturn a standing decision of the United States Supreme Court in a District Court."
10	DEFORE 1020 PARTIES AND 100
11	BEFORE 1938 - PUBLIC LAW "Statute" versus
12	AFTER 1938 - PUBLIC POLICY "Statute"
13	He said,
99 9950	rie salu,
14 15	"Name any decision of the Supreme Court after 1938 and I'll honor it, but all the decision you read were prior to 1938, and I don't honor
16	those decisions."
17	I asked what happened in 1938. He said,
18 19 20 21	"Prior to 1938, the Supreme Court was dealing with Public Law; since 1938, the Supreme Court has dealt with Public Policy. The charge that Mr. S. was being tried for is a <i>Public Policy Statute</i> , not Public Law, and those Supreme Court cases do not apply to Public Policy."
22	I asked him what happened in 1938? He said that he had already told me too much -
23	he wasn't going to tell me any more.
24 25	1938 AND THE ERIE RAILROAD
26 27 28	Michael Willis of the Chase family – "FOR THE RECORD: DECLARED WITNESSED TESTIMONY OF MICHAEL WILLIS OF THE CHASE FAMILY. NOTICE OF PAYMENT OF COURT ORDER OF COMMISSIONER JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER 839377707 ACCORDING TO THE COINAGE ACT OF APRIL 2, 1792, AND COMMISSIONER JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER 839377707 OATH OF STATE AND FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONS ARTICLE I. SECTION 10

CLAUSE I." PAGE 9 OF 36

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24 25

26 27

28

Well, I began to investigate. I found that 1938 was the year of the **Erie** Railroad versus Tompkins case of the Supreme Court. It was also the year the courts claim they blended Law with Equity. I read the Erie Railroad case. A man had sued the Erie Railroad for damages when he was struck by a board sticking out of a boxcar as he walked along beside the tracks. The district court had decided on the basis of *Commercial (Negotiable Instruments) Law:* that this man was not under any contract with the Erie Railroad, and therefore he had no standing to sue the company. Under the Common Law, he was damaged and he would have had the right to sue.

¶27. This overturned a standing decision of over one hundred years. Swift versus **Tyson** in 1840 was a similar case, and the decision of the Supreme Court was that in any case of this type, the court would judge the case on the Common Law of the state where the incident occurred - in this case Pennsylvania. BUT IN THE ERIE RAILROAD CASE, THE SUPREME COURT RULED THAT ALL FEDERAL CASES WILL BE JUDGED UNDER THE NEGOTIABLE INSTRUMENTS LAW. There would be no more decisions based on the Common Law at the federal level. So here we find the blending of Law with Equity.

¶28. This was a puzzle to me. As I put these new pieces together, I determined that all our courts since 1938 were Merchant Law courts and not Common Law courts. There were still some pieces of the puzzle missing.

A FRIEND IN THE COURT

¶29. Fortunately, I made a friend of a judge. Now you won't make friends with a judge if you go into court like a "wolf in black sheep country." You must approach him as though you are the sheep and he is the wolf. If you go into court as a wolf, you make demands and tell the judge what the law is - how he had better uphold the law or else. Remember the verse: I send you out as sheep in wolf country; be wise as a serpent and harmless as a dove. We have to go into court and be wise and harmless, and not make demands. We must play a little dumb and ask a lot of questions. Well, I asked a lot of questions and boxed the judges into a corner where they had to give me a victory or admit what they didn't want to admit. I won the case, and on the way out I had to stop by the clerk's office to get some papers. One of the judges stopped and said,

"You're an interesting man, Mr. Freeman. If you're ever in town, stop by, and if I'm not sitting on a case we will visit."

AMERICA IS BANKRUPT

¶30. Later, when I went to visit the judge, I told him of my problem with the Supreme Court cases dealing with Public Policy rather than the Public Law. He said,

"In 1938, all the higher judges, the top attorneys and the U.S. attorneys were called into a secret meeting and this is what we were told:

America is a bankrupt nation - it is owned completely by its creditors. The creditors own the Congress, they own the Executive, they own the Judiciary and they own all the state governments.

Take silent judicial notice of this fact, but never reveal it openly.

Your court is operating in an <u>Admiralty</u> <u>Jurisdiction</u> - call it anything you want, but do not call it Admiralty."

ADMIRALTY COURTS

¶31. The reason they cannot call it *Admiralty Jurisdiction* is that your defense would be quite different in *Admiralty Jurisdiction* from your defense under the Common Law. *In Admiralty*, there is *NO* court which has *jurisdiction* unless there is a valid *international contract* in dispute. If you know it is *Admiralty Jurisdiction*, and they have admitted on the record that you are in Admiralty Court, you can demand that the international maritime contract, to which you are supposedly a party, and which you supposedly have breached, *be placed into evidence. NO* court has *Admiralty/Maritime Jurisdiction* unless there is a valid international maritime contract that has been breached.

So you say, just innocently like a lamb,

"Well, I didn't know that I got involved with an *international maritime* contract, so, in good faith, *I deny that such a contract exists*. If this court is taking jurisdiction in Admiralty, then, pursuant to section 3-501 of your UCC, (Presentment), the prosecutor will have no difficulty placing the [alleged] contract into evidence, so that I may examine and [possibly] challenge the validity of the contract."

Michael Willis of the Chase family – "FOR THE RECORD: DECLARED WITNESSED TESTIMONY OF MICHAEL WILLIS OF THE CHASE FAMILY. NOTICE OF PAYMENT OF COURT ORDER OF COMMISSIONER JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER 839377707 ACCORDING TO THE COINAGE ACT OF APRIL 2, 1792, AND COMMISSIONER JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER 839377707 OATH OF STATE AND FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONS ARTICLE I, SECTION 10,

¶32. What they would have to do is place the national debt into evidence. They would have to admit that the international bankers own the whole nation, and that we are their slaves.

NOT EXPEDIENT

¶33. BUT THE BANKERS SAID IT IS NOT EXPEDIENT AT THIS TIME TO ADMIT THAT THEY OWN EVERYTHING AND COULD FORECLOSE ON EVERY NATION OF THE WORLD. The reason they don't want to tell everyone that they own everything is that there are still too many privately owned guns. There are uncooperative armies and other military forces. So until they can gradually consolidate all armies into a WORLD ARMY and all courts into a single WORLD COURT, it is not expedient to admit the jurisdiction the courts are operating under. When we understand these things, we realize that there are certain secrets they don't want to admit, and we can use this to our benefit.

JURISDICTION

 \P 34. The Constitution of the United States mentions three areas of <u>jurisdiction</u> in which the courts may operate:

Common Law

¶35. Common Law is based on God's law. Anytime someone is charged under the Common Law, there <u>must</u> be a damaged party (a corpus delicti). You are free under the Common Law to do anything you please, as long as you do <u>not</u> infringe on the

Michael Willis of the Chase family – "FOR THE RECORD: DECLARED WITNESSED TESTIMONY OF MICHAEL WILLIS OF THE CHASE FAMILY. NOTICE OF PAYMENT OF COURT ORDER OF COMMISSIONER JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER 839377707 ACCORDING TO THE COINAGE ACT OF APRIL 2, 1792, AND COMMISSIONER JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER 839377707 OATH OF STATE AND FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONS ARTICLE I, SECTION 10, CLAUSE I."

1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		

26

27

28

life, liberty, or property of someone else. You have a right to make a fool of yourself provided you do <u>not</u> infringe on the life, liberty, or property of someone else. The Common Law does <u>not</u> allow for any government action which prevents a man from making a fool of himself. For instance, when you cross over the state lines in most states, you will see a sign which says,

"BUCKLE YOUR SEAT BELTS - IT'S THE LAW."

¶36. This <u>cannot</u> be Common Law, because who would you injure if you did <u>not</u> buckle up? Nobody. This would be compelled performance. But Common Law <u>cannot compel performance</u>. Any violation of Common Law is a CRIMINAL ACT, and is punishable.

Equity Law

¶37. Equity Law is law which <u>compels performance</u>. It compels you to perform to the exact letter of any contract that you are under. So, if you have compelled performance, there <u>must</u> be a contract somewhere, and you are being compelled to perform under the obligation of the contract. Now this can only be a civil action - <u>not</u> criminal. In Equity <u>Jurisdiction</u>, you <u>cannot</u> be tried <u>criminally</u>, but you can be compelled to perform to the letter of a contract.

¶38. IF YOU THEN <u>REFUSE</u> TO PERFORM AS DIRECTED BY THE COURT, YOU CAN BE CHARGED WITH CONTEMPT OF COURT, WHICH IS A CRIMINAL ACTION. Are our seatbelt laws, Equity Laws? No, they are <u>not</u>, because you <u>cannot</u> be penalized or punished for <u>not</u> keeping to the letter of a

Michael Willis of the Chase family – "FOR THE RECORD: DECLARED WITNESSED TESTIMONY OF MICHAEL WILLIS OF THE CHASE FAMILY. NOTICE OF PAYMENT OF COURT ORDER OF COMMISSIONER JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER 839377707 ACCORDING TO THE COINAGE ACT OF APRIL 2, 1792, AND COMMISSIONER JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER 839377707 OATH OF STATE AND FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONS ARTICLE I, SECTION 10, CLAUSE I."

PAGE 14 OF 36

1	contract.
1	contract.

Admiralty/Maritime Laws

¶39. This is *civil <u>jurisdiction</u>* of Compelled Performance which also has *Criminal Penalties* for <u>not</u> adhering to the letter of the contract, but this only applies to *International Contracts*.

¶40. Now we can see what jurisdiction the seatbelt laws (all traffic codes, etc) are under. Whenever there is a penalty for failure to perform (such as willful failure to file), that is Admiralty/Maritime Law and there <u>must</u> be a valid international contract in force. However, the courts don't want to admit that they are operating under Admiralty/Maritime <u>Jurisdictions</u>, so they took the international law or <u>Law Merchant</u> and adopted it into our codes. That is what the Supreme Court decided in the Erie Railroad case - that the decisions will be based on <u>commercial law</u> or <u>business law</u> and that it will have <u>criminal penalties</u> associated with it. SINCE THEY [JUDGES] WERE INSTRUCTED <u>NOT</u> TO CALL IT, ADMIRALTY JURISDICTION, THEY CALL IT <u>STATUTORY JURISDICTION</u>.

COURTS OF CONTRACT

¶41. You <u>must</u> ask how we got into this situation where we can be charged with failure to wear seatbelts and be fined for it. *Isn't the judge sworn to up hold the Constitution?* Yes, he is. But you <u>must</u> understand *the Constitution, in Article I, §10*, gives us the unlimited right to contract, as long as we do <u>not</u> infringe on the life, liberty or property of someone else. Contracts are enforceable, and the Constitution gives <u>two jurisdictions</u> where contracts can be enforced - Equity or Admiralty. *But*

Michael Willis of the Chase family – "FOR THE RECORD: DECLARED WITNESSED TESTIMONY OF MICHAEL WILLIS OF THE CHASE FAMILY. NOTICE OF PAYMENT OF COURT ORDER OF COMMISSIONER JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER 839377707 ACCORDING TO THE COINAGE ACT OF APRIL 2, 1792, AND COMMISSIONER JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER 839377707 OATH OF STATE AND FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONS ARTICLE I, SECTION 10, CLAUSE I."

2	courts, but we can use this to box the judges into a corner in their own courts. We
3	will cover this more later.
4	
5	CONTRACTS MUST BE VOLUNTARY
6	¶42. Under the Common Law, every contract <u>must</u> be enter into <u>knowingly</u> ,
7	<u>voluntarily</u> , <u>and intentionally</u> by both parties or it is <u>void</u> and <u>enforceable</u> . These are
8	characteristic - it <u>must</u> be based on substance. For example, contracts used to read,
9	
10	"For one dollar and other valuable considerations, I will paint your house, etc."
11	¶43. That was a valid contract - the dollar was a genuine, silver dollar. Now,
12	
13	suppose you wrote a contract that said,
14	"For one Federal Reserve Note and other considerations, I will paint your
15	house"
16	¶44. And suppose, for example, I painted your house the wrong color. Could you go
17	into a Common Law court and get justice? No, you could not. You see, a Federal
18	Reserve Note is a " <u>colorable</u> " 1 dollar, as it has <u>no</u> substance, and in a Common
19	Law <u>Jurisdiction</u> , that contract would be <u>unenforceable</u> .
20	
21	colorABLE MONEY - colorABLE COURTS
22	¶45. The word " <u>colorable</u> " means something that appears to be genuine, but is <u>not</u> .
23	Maybe it looks like a dollar, and maybe it spends like a dollar, but if it is not
24	redeemable for lawful money (silver or gold) it is "colorable." If a Federal Reserve
25	
26	Michael Willis of the Chase family – "FOR THE RECORD: DECLARED WITNESSED TESTIMONY
27	OF MICHAEL WILLIS OF THE CHASE FAMILY. NOTICE OF PAYMENT OF COURT ORDER OF COMMISSIONER JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER 839377707 ACCORDING TO THE
28	COINAGE ACT OF APRIL 2, 1792, AND COMMISSIONER JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER 839377707 OATH OF STATE AND FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONS ARTICLE I, SECTION 10, CLAUSE I."

we find them being in Statutory Jurisdiction. This is the embarrassing part for the

PAGE 16 OF 36

9

10 11

13

14

12

15 16 17

18 19

20 21

22 23

24

Note is used in a contract, then the contract becomes a "colorable" contract. And "colorable" contracts must be enforced under a "colorable" jurisdiction. So by creating Federal Reserve Notes, the government had to create a *jurisdiction* to cover the kinds of contracts which use them. We now have what is called Statutory <u>Jurisdiction</u>, which is <u>not</u> a genuine Admiralty jurisdiction.

1 colorable: That which is in appearance only, and not in reality, what it purports to be, hence counterfeit, feigned having the appearance of truth. Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition.

¶46. It is "colorable" Admiralty Jurisdiction the judges are enforcing because we are using "colorable money" colorable Admiralty is now known as Statutory **Jurisdiction**. Let's see how we got under this **Statutory <u>Jurisdiction</u>**.

UNIFORM COMMERCIAL CODE

The government set up a "colorable" law system to fit the "colorable" ¶47. currency. It used to be called the Law Merchant or the Law of Redeemable Instruments, because it dealt with paper which was redeemable in something of substance. But, once Federal Reserve Notes had become unredeemable, there had to be a system of law which was completely "colorable" from start to finish. this system of law was codified as the Uniform Commercial Code, and has been adopted in every state. This is "colorable" law, and it is used in all the courts. I explained one of the keys earlier, which is that the country is **bankrupt** and we have **no** rights. If the master says "Jump!" then the slave had better jump, because the master has the right to cut off his head. As slaves we have no rights. But the creditors/masters had to cover that up, so they created a system of law called the Uniform Commercial Code.

Michael Willis of the Chase family - "FOR THE RECORD: DECLARED WITNESSED TESTIMONY OF MICHAEL WILLIS OF THE CHASE FAMILY. NOTICE OF PAYMENT OF COURT ORDER OF COMMISSIONER JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER 839377707 ACCORDING TO THE COINAGE ACT OF APRIL 2, 1792, AND COMMISSIONER JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER 839377707 OATH OF STATE AND FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONS ARTICLE I, SECTION 10, **CLAUSE I."**

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9

This "*colorable*" *jurisdiction* under the Uniform Commercial Code is the next key to understanding what happened.

CONTRACT OR AGREEMENT

¶48. One difference between Common Law and the Uniform Commercial Code is that in Common Law, contracts <u>must</u> be entered into (1) <u>knowingly</u>, (2) <u>voluntarily</u>, and (3) <u>intentionally</u>. Under the U.C.C., this is <u>not</u> so. <u>First</u> of all, contracts are unnecessary. Under this new law, "<u>agreements</u>" can be binding, and if you only exercise the <u>benefits</u> of an "<u>agreements</u>," it is <u>presumed</u> or <u>implied</u> that you <u>intend</u> to meet the <u>obligations</u> associated with those <u>benefits</u>. If you accept a benefit offered by government, then you are obligated to follow, to the letter, each and every statute involved with that benefit. The method has been to get everyone exercising a benefit, and they [the courts] don't even have to tell the people what the benefit is. Some people think it is the driver's license, the marriage license or the birth certificate, etc. I believe it is none of these.

COMPELLED BENEFIT

¶49. I believe the benefit being used is that we have been given the <u>privilege</u> of <u>discharging debt</u> with <u>limited liability</u>, instead of <u>paying debt</u>. When we <u>pay</u> a <u>debt</u>, we give <u>substance</u> for <u>substance</u>. If I buy a quart of milk with a silver dollar, that dollar bought the milk, and the milk bought the dollar - substance for substance. But if I use a Federal Reserve Note to buy the milk, I have <u>not</u> paid for it. There is <u>no</u> substance in the Federal Reserve Note. It is <u>worthless paper</u> given in exchange for something of substantive value. Congress offers us this <u>benefit</u>:

Michael Willis of the Chase family – "FOR THE RECORD: DECLARED WITNESSED TESTIMONY OF MICHAEL WILLIS OF THE CHASE FAMILY. NOTICE OF PAYMENT OF COURT ORDER OF COMMISSIONER JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER 839377707 ACCORDING TO THE COINAGE ACT OF APRIL 2, 1792, AND COMMISSIONER JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER 839377707 OATH OF STATE AND FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONS ARTICLE I, SECTION 10, CLAUSE I."

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22 23

24

25

26

27

28

¶50. Debt money, created by the federal United States, can be spent all over the United States of America, it will be legal tender for all debts, public and private, and the limited liability is that you *cannot* be sued for *not* paying your debt.

So now they have said,

"We going to help you out, and you can just discharge your debts instead of paying your debts."

¶51. When we use this "colorable" money to discharge our debts, we cannot use a Common Law court. We can only use a "colorable" court. We are completely under the UCC, using non-redeemable negotiable instruments and we are discharging debt rather than paying debt.

REMEDY AND RECOURSE

¶52. Every system of civilized law must have two characteristics: Remedy and Recourse. Remedy is a way to get out from under that law, and you recover your loss. The Common Law, the Law Merchants, and even the Uniform Commercial Code all have remedy and recourse, but for a long time we could not find them. If you go to a law library and ask to see the Uniform Commercial Code, they will show you a shelf of books completely filled with the Uniform Commercial Code. When you pick up one volume and start to read it, it will seem to have been intentionally written to be confusing. It took us a long time to discover where the Remedy and Recourse are found in their UCC. They are found right in the first volume, at 1-308 (old 1-207) and 1-103.

Michael Willis of the Chase family - "FOR THE RECORD: DECLARED WITNESSED TESTIMONY OF MICHAEL WILLIS OF THE CHASE FAMILY. NOTICE OF PAYMENT OF COURT ORDER OF COMMISSIONER JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER 839377707 ACCORDING TO THE COINAGE ACT OF APRIL 2, 1792, AND COMMISSIONER JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER 839377707 OATH OF STATE AND FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONS ARTICLE I, SECTION 10, **CLAUSE I."**

2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

28

1

REMEDY

¶53. The making of a valid <u>Reservation of Rights</u> preserves whatever rights the person then possesses, and prevents the loss of such rights by application of concepts of <u>waiver or estoppel</u>. (UCC 1-308 (old 1-207).7). It is important to remember when we go into a court that we are in a <u>commercial international jurisdiction</u>. If we go into court and say,

"I DEMAND MY CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS,"

the judge will most likely say,

"You mention the Constitution again, and I'll find you in contempt of court!"

¶54. Then we don't understand how he can do that. Hasn't he sworn to uphold the Constitution? *The <u>rule here is:</u>* you <u>cannot</u> be charged under one <u>jurisdiction</u>, and defend under another. For example, if the French government came to you and asked where you filed your French income tax in a certain year, do you go to the French government and say,

"I demand my Constitutional Right?"

¶55. No. *The proper answer is: THE LAW DOESN'T APPLY TO ME - I'M NOT A FRENCHMAN*. You must make your reservation of rights under the *jurisdiction* in which you are charged - not under some other *jurisdiction*. So in a UCC court, you must claim your reservation of rights under (pursuant to) the [their] U.C.C. 1-308 (old 1-207). *UCC 1-308 (old 1-207) goes on to say:*

Michael Willis of the Chase family – "FOR THE RECORD: DECLARED WITNESSED TESTIMONY OF MICHAEL WILLIS OF THE CHASE FAMILY. NOTICE OF PAYMENT OF COURT ORDER OF COMMISSIONER JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER 839377707 ACCORDING TO THE COINAGE ACT OF APRIL 2, 1792, AND COMMISSIONER JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER 839377707 OATH OF STATE AND FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONS ARTICLE I, SECTION 10, CLAUSE I."

When a waivable right or claim is involved, the failure to make a reservation thereof, causes a loss of the right, and bars its assertion at a later date. (UCC 1-308 (old 1-207).9).

¶56. You have to make your claim known early. Further, it says:

The Sufficiency of the Reservation - Any expression indicating an intention to reserve rights, is sufficient, such as "WITHOUT PREJUDICE." (UCC 1-308 (old 1-207).4)

¶57. Whenever you sign any legal paper that deals with Federal Reserve Notes (FRNs) -in any way, shape or manner - under your signature write:

Without Prejudice UCC 1-308 (old 1-207).

¶58. This reserves your rights. You can show, at 1-308 (old 1-207).4 that you have sufficiently reserved your rights. *It is very important to understand just what this means*. For example, one man who used this in regard to a traffic ticket was asked by the judge just what he meant by writing "without prejudice UCC 1-308 (old 1-207)" on his statement to the court. He had <u>not</u> tried to understand the concepts involved. He only wanted to use it to get out of the ticket. He did <u>not</u> know what it meant. When the judge asked him what he meant by signing in that way, he told the judge that

"he was not prejudiced against anyone..."

¶59. The judge knew that the man had \underline{no} idea what it meant, and fined him an additional \$25.00 for a frivolous defense. You *must* know what it means.

2 3

4

5 6

7 8

9

10 11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

26

27

28

WITHOUT PREJUDICE Pursuant to UCC 1-308

When you see "Without Prejudice" UCC 1-308 in connection with your ¶60. signature, you are saying:

"I reserve my right not to be compelled to perform under any contract, commercial agreement or bankruptcy that I did not enter knowingly, voluntarily, and intentionally. And furthermore, I do not and will not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any unrevealed contract or commercial agreement or bankruptcy."

¶61. Actually, it is better to use a rubber stamp, because this demonstrates that you had previously reserved your rights. The simple fact that it takes several days or a week to order and get a stamp shows that you had reserved your rights before signing the document. What is the compelled performance of an unrevealed commercial agreement? When you use Federal Reserve Notes instead of silver dollars, is it voluntary? No. There is no lawful money, so you have to use Federal Reserve Notes - you have to accept the benefit. the government has given you the benefit to discharge your debts with limited liability, and you don't have to pay your debts. How nice they are! But if you did **not** reserve your rights under 1-308 (old 1-207).7, you are compelled to accept the benefit, and are therefore obligated to obey every statute, ordinance and regulation of the government, at all levels of government federal, state and local.

¶62. If you understand this, you will be asked to explain it to the judge when asks. And he will ask, so be prepared to explain it to the court. You will also need to understand UCC 1-103 - the argument and recourse. If you want to understand this

Michael Willis of the Chase family - "FOR THE RECORD: DECLARED WITNESSED TESTIMONY OF MICHAEL WILLIS OF THE CHASE FAMILY. NOTICE OF PAYMENT OF COURT ORDER OF COMMISSIONER JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER 839377707 ACCORDING TO THE COINAGE ACT OF APRIL 2, 1792, AND COMMISSIONER JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER 839377707 OATH OF STATE AND FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONS ARTICLE I, SECTION 10, **CLAUSE I."**

1	fully, go to a law library and photocopy these two sections from the UCC. It is
2	important to get the Anderson [Anderson, Uniform Commercial Code, Lawyers
3	Cooperative Publishing Company] edition. Some of the law libraries will only
4	have the West Publishing version, and it is very difficult to understand. In Anderson,
5	it is broken down with decimals into ten parts, and most importantly, it is written in
6	plain English.
7	
8	RECOURSE
9	¶63. The Recourse appears in the Uniform Commercial Code at 1-103.6, which
10	says:
11	The Code is complimentary to the Common Law, which remains in force,
12	<u>except</u> where <u>displaced</u> by the code. A statute should be <u>construed</u> in harmony with the Common Law, unless <u>there</u> is a clear legislative intent to
13	abrogate the Common Law.
14	¶64. This is the argument we use in court:
15 16 17 18 19	The Code <u>recognizes</u> the Common Law. If it did <u>not</u> recognize the Common Law, the government would have had to admit that the United States is bankrupt, and is completely owned by its creditors. But, it is <u>not</u> expedient to admit this, so the Code was written so as <u>not</u> to abolish the Common Law entirely.
20	¶65. Therefore, if you have made a sufficient, timely, and explicit reservation of
21	your rights at 1-308 (old 1-207), you may then <u>insist</u> that the statutes be construed in
22	harmony with the Common Law. If the charge is a traffic, you may demand that the
23	court <i>produce the injured person</i> who has filed a <u>verified complaint</u> . If, for example,
24	you were charged with failure to buckle your seatbelt, you may ask the court
25	
26	Michael Willia of the Chase family, "EOD THE DECORD, DECLARED WITNESCED TERMINANNA

27

28

¶66. However, if the judge won't listen to you and just moves ahead with the case,

then you will want to read to him that last sentence of 1-103.6 which states:

The Code cannot be read to preclude a Common Law action.

"Your Honor, I can sue you under the Common Law, for violating my right under the Uniform Commercial Code. I have a remedy, under the, UCC to reserve my rights under the Common Law. I have exercised the remedy, and now you must construe this statute in harmony with the Common Law, you must come forth with the damaged party."

¶68. If the judge insists on proceeding with the case, just act confused and ask this

"Let me see if I understand, Your Honor, has this court made a judicial determination that the Sections 1-308 (old 1-207) and 1-103 of the Uniform Commercial Code, which is the system of law you are operating under, are not valid law before this court?"

¶69. Now the judge is in a jamb! How can the court throw out one part of the Code and uphold another? If he answers, "yes," then you say:

"I put this court on notice that I am appealing your judicial

¶70. Of course, the higher court will uphold the Code on appeal. The judge knows this, so once again you have boxed him into a corner.

Michael Willis of the Chase family - "FOR THE RECORD: DECLARED WITNESSED TESTIMONY OF MICHAEL WILLIS OF THE CHASE FAMILY. NOTICE OF PAYMENT OF COURT ORDER OF COMMISSIONER JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER 839377707 ACCORDING TO THE COINAGE ACT OF APRIL 2, 1792, AND COMMISSIONER JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER 839377707 OATH OF STATE AND FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONS ARTICLE I, SECTION 10, CLAUSE I."

PAGE 24 OF 36

27 28

PRACTICAL APPLICATION - TRAFFIC COURT

¶71. Just so we can understand how this whole process works, let us look at a court situation such as a traffic violation. Assume you ran through a yellow light and a policeman gave you a traffic ticket.

1. The first thing you want to do is to delay the action at least three weeks. This you can do by being pleasant and cooperative with the officer. Explain to him that you are very busy and ask if he could please set your court appearance for about three weeks away.

[At this point we need to remember the government's trick: "I'm from the government, and I'm here to help you." Now we want to use this approach with them].

2. The next step is to go the clerk of the traffic court and say:

"I believe it would be helpful if I talk to you, because I want to save the government some money (this will get their attention). I am undoubtedly going to appeal this case. As you know, in an appeal, I have to have a transcript, but the traffic court doesn't have a court reporter. It would be a waste of taxpayer's money to run me through this court and then to have to give me a trial de novo in a court of record. I do need a transcript for appealing, and to save the government some money, maybe you could schedule me to appear in a court of record."

You can show the date on the ticket and the clerk will usually agree that there is plenty of time to schedule your trial for a court of record. Now your first appearance is in a court of record and not in a traffic court, where there is **no** record.

3. When you get into court, the judge will read the charges: driving through a yellow

1	light or whatever, and this is a violation of ordinance XYZ. He will ask,
2	
3	"Do you understand the charges against you?"
4	4. It is very important to get it read into the record, that you do not understand the
5	charges. With that in the record, the court cannot move forward to judge the facts
6	This will be answered later.
7	5.
8	"Well, Your Honor, there is a question I would like to ask before I can
9 10	make a plea of innocent or guilty. I think it could be answered if I could put the officer on the stand for a moment and ask him a few
11	short questions.
12	Judge: "I don't see why not. Let's swear the officer in and have him take the
13	stand."
14	"Is this the instrument that you gave me?" (Handing him the traffic
15	citation).
16	Officer:
17 18	"Yes, this is a copy of it. The judge has the other portion of it."
19	"Where did you get my address that you wrote on that citation?"
20	Officer:
21	
22	"Well, I got it from your driver's license." (Handing the officer your driver's license)
2324	"Is this the document you copied my name and address from?"
25	
26	Michael Willis of the Chase family – "FOR THE RECORD: DECLARED WITNESSED TESTIMONY
27	OF MICHAEL WILLIS OF THE CHASE FAMILY. NOTICE OF PAYMENT OF COURT ORDER OF COMMISSIONER JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER 839377707 ACCORDING TO THE
28	COINAGE ACT OF APRIL 2, 1792, AND COMMISSIONER JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER

1	Officer:
2	"Yes, this is where I got it."
3 4	"While you've got it in your hand, would you read the signature that's
5	on that license?
6	(The officer reads the signature).
7 8	"While you're there, would you read into the record what it says under the signature?"
9	Officer:
10	"It says, "Without Prejudice, UCC 1-308." [old 1-207]
11 12	Judge:
13	"Let me see that license!"
14 15	(He looks at it turns to the officer).
16	"You didn't notice this printing under the signature on this license, when you copied his name and address onto the ticket?"
17 18	Officer:
19	"Oh, no, I was just getting the address - I didn't look down there."
20 21	Judge:
22	"You're not very observant as an officer. Therefore, I'm afraid I
23	cannot accept your testimony in regards to the facts of this case. This case is dismissed."
24 25	6. a. you had reserved your Common Law rights under the UCC;
26 27 28	Michael Willis of the Chase family – "FOR THE RECORD: DECLARED WITNESSED TESTIMONY OF MICHAEL WILLIS OF THE CHASE FAMILY. NOTICE OF PAYMENT OF COURT ORDER O COMMISSIONER JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER 839377707 ACCORDING TO THE COINAGE ACT OF APRIL 2, 1792, AND COMMISSIONER JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER 839377707 OATH OF STATE AND FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONS ARTICLE I, SECTION 10, CLAUSE I."

PAGE 27 OF 36

- **b.** you had done it sufficiently by writing "Without Prejudice, UCC 1-308 (old 1-207)" on your driver's license;
- **c.** the statute would now have to be read on harmony with the Common Law, and the Common Law says the statute exists, but there is no injured party; and
- **d.** since there is no injured party or complaining witness, the court has no *jurisdiction* under the Common Law.
- 7. If the judge tries to move ahead and try the facts of the case, then you will want to ask him the following question:

"Your Honor, let me understand this correctly, has the court made a <u>judicial determination</u> that it has authority under the <u>jurisdiction</u> that it is operating under, to <u>ignore</u> two sections of the <u>Uniform Commercial Code</u> which have been called to its attention? If he says, yes, tell him that you put the court on <u>notice</u> that you will appeal that judicial determination, and that if you are damaged by his actions, you will <u>sue him</u> in Common Law action - under the <u>jurisdiction</u> of the U.C.C."

QUESTIONS AND REVIEW

¶72. Note: These are some of the questions asked after the main lecture. Some are restatements of material presented earlier, but they contain very valuable information which is worth repeating.

COURTROOM TECHNIQUES

- ¶73. Question: How did you "box in" the judge? This is easy to do if you don't know too much. I didn't know too much, but I boxed them in. You must play a little ignorant.
- ¶74. If you are arrested and you go to court, just remember that in a <u>criminal</u>

Michael Willis of the Chase family – "FOR THE RECORD: DECLARED WITNESSED TESTIMONY OF MICHAEL WILLIS OF THE CHASE FAMILY. NOTICE OF PAYMENT OF COURT ORDER OF COMMISSIONER JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER 839377707 ACCORDING TO THE COINAGE ACT OF APRIL 2, 1792, AND COMMISSIONER JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER 839377707 OATH OF STATE AND FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONS ARTICLE I, SECTION 10, CLAUSE I."

1	<u>action</u> , you have to <u>understand the law</u> or it is a <u>reversible</u> <u>error</u> for the court to try
2	you. If you don't understand the law, they can't try you.
3	
4	¶75. In any traffic court case or tax case you are called into court and the judge reads
5	the law and then asks,
6	"Do you <u>understand</u> the charges?"
7	
8	Defendant:
9	"No, (Your Honor,) I do <u>not</u> !"
10	Judge:
11	
12	"Well, what's so difficult about that charge? Either you drove the wrong way on a one-way street or you didn't. You can only go one way
13	on that street, and if you go the other way, it's a fifty dollar fine.
14	What's so difficult about this that you <u>don't understand?</u> "
15	Defendant:
16	"Well, Your Honor, it's <i>not</i> the letter of the law, but rather the <u>nature</u>
17	of the law that I don't understand. The Sixth Amendment of the
18	Constitution gives me the right to request the court to explain the <u>nature of any action</u> against me, and upon my request, the <u>court has the</u>
19	<u>duty</u> to answer. I have a question about the <u>nature of this action</u> ."
20	Judge:
21	
22	"Well, what is that - what do you want to know?"
23	¶76. Always! Ask them some easy questions first, as this establishes that they are
24	answering. You ask:
25	
26	Michael Willis of the Chase family – "FOR THE RECORD: DECLARED WITNESSED TESTIMONY
27	OF MICHAEL WILLIS OF THE CHASE FAMILY. NOTICE OF PAYMENT OF COURT ORDER OF COMMISSIONER JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER 839377707 ACCORDING TO THE COINAGE ACT OF APRIL 2, 1792, AND COMMISSIONER JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER 839377707 OATH OF STATE AND FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONS ARTICLE I, SECTION 10,
28	

CLAUSE I." PAGE 29 OF 36

1	
2	Defendant:
3	"Well, Your Honor, is this a Civil or Criminal Action?"
4	Judge:
5	"It is criminal."
6	it is criminal.
7	(If it were a civil action there could be <u>no fine</u> , so it has to be criminal).
8	Defendant:
9	"Thank you, Your Honor, for telling me that. Then the record will
10	show that this action against(Straw Man Name) is a criminal
11	action, is that right?"
12	Judge:
13 14	"Yes."
15	Defendant:
16	"I would like to ask another question about this criminal action. There are two criminal jurisdictions mentioned in the Constitution; one is under the Common Law, and the other deals with International Maritime Contracts, under an Admiralty Jurisdiction. Equity is Civil, and you said this is a Criminal action, so it seems it would have to be under either the Common Law, or Maritime Law. But what puzzles me, Your Honor, is, there is no Corpus Delicti here that gives this court a jurisdiction over my person and property under the Common Law. Therefore, it doesn't appear to me that this court is moving under the Common Law."
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	Judge:
2425	
26	THE RECORD, DECLARED WITNESSED TESTIMONY
27	Michael Willis of the Chase family – "FOR THE RECORD: DECLARED WITNESSED TESTIMONY OF MICHAEL WILLIS OF THE CHASE FAMILY. NOTICE OF PAYMENT OF COURT ORDER O COMMISSIONER JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER 839377707 ACCORDING TO THE
28	COMMISSIONER JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER 839377707 ACCORDING TO THE COINAGE ACT OF APRIL 2, 1792, AND COMMISSIONER JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER 830377707 OATH OF STATE AND FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONS ARTICLE I. SECTION 10.

DINAGE ACT OF APRIL 2, 1792, AND COMMISSIONER JUHN D. NAFFER D-0-10-5 MORRA 839377707 OATH OF STATE AND FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONS ARTICLE I, SECTION 10, CLAUSE I." PAGE 30 OF 36

1	"No, I can assure you this court is not moving under the Common
2	Law."
3	Defendant:
4	"Well, thank you, your Honor, but now you make the charge against
5	me even more difficult to <u>understand</u> , the only other <u>crimin</u> <u>jurisdiction</u> would apply only if there was an <u>International Maritin</u> <u>Contract</u> involved and I was a party to it, it had been <u>Breached</u> , and the court was operating in an <u>Admiralty Jurisdiction</u> .
6 7	
8	
9	I don't believe I have ever been under any <u>International Maritime</u> <u>Contract</u> , so I would deny that one exists. I would have to <u>demand</u> that
10	such a contract, if it does exist, <u>be placed into evidence</u> , so that I may <u>contest</u> it, but surely, this court is <u>not</u> operating under an <u>Admiralty</u>
11	Jurisdiction."
12	You just put words in the judge's mouth.
13 14	Judge:
15	"No I can accure you
16	" <u>No</u> , I can assure you, we're <u>not</u> operating under an <u>Admiralty</u> <u>Jurisdiction</u> . We're <u>not</u> out in the ocean somewhere - we're right here in the middle of the State of North Carolina, <u>No</u> , this is not an <u>Admiralty</u>
17	Jurisdiction."
18 19	Defendant:
20	"Thank you, Your Honor, but now I am more puzzled than ever. If
21	this/these charge/s is/are <u>not</u> under the Common Law, or under Admiralty - and those are the only <u>criminal jurisdictions</u> mentioned in
$\begin{bmatrix} 22 \\ 23 \end{bmatrix}$	the Constitution - what kind of <u>jurisdiction</u> could this court be operating under?"
23 24	Judge:
25	
26	Michael Willis of the Chase family, "FOR TWO DECORATED
27 28	Michael Willis of the Chase family – "FOR THE RECORD: DECLARED WITNESSED TESTIMONY OF MICHAEL WILLIS OF THE CHASE FAMILY. NOTICE OF PAYMENT OF COURT ORDER OF COMMISSIONER JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER 839377707 ACCORDING TO THE COINAGE ACT OF APRIL 2, 1792, AND COMMISSIONER JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER 839377707 OATH OF STATE AND FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONS ARTICLE I, SECTION 10, CLAUSE I." PAGE 31 OF 36

1

Defendant:

3

4

5

6

7

8

O

9

11

12

13

14

15

1617

18

19

20

21

2223

24

25

26

27

28

"Oh, thank you, Your Honor. I'm glad you told me that. But I have never heard of that jurisdiction.

SO, IF I HAVE TO DEFEND UNDER THAT, I WOULD NEED TO HAVE THE RULES OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE FOR STATUTORY JURISDICTION.

Can you provide me with the location of a copy?"

THE END!

¶76. The Declarant, Michael Willis of the Chase Family is ready to file suit in all higher courts. Put on notice: "State of Alert": The Privy Council United Kingdom (Her Majesty The Queen), The Vatican (Most Holy Pope Francis), Immaculate Conception Parish Catholic Church (Rev. David J. Kelash) Cottonwood Arizona, Jewish Community Synagogue Sedona (Rabbi Alicia Magal) Arizona, New Hope Christian Fellowship Cottonwood Arizona, Unity of Sedona (Michael Mirdad) Arizona, United States Government (Delaware Corporation by Scotland, owned by Queen), The White House (President Biden), Secretary of Defense (Lloyd J. Austin III), CIA/FBI Directors (William Joseph Burns/Christopher Asher Wray), United States Attorney General (Merrick Brian Garland), Arizona Governor (Doug Ducey), Arizona Attorney General (Mark Arizona Sinema/Mark Kelly, (Kyrsten Arizona Senators Brnovich), Congressmen/women (Thomas Charles O'Halleran, Ann Leila Kirkpatrick, Raúl

Michael Willis of the Chase family – "FOR THE RECORD: DECLARED WITNESSED TESTIMONY OF MICHAEL WILLIS OF THE CHASE FAMILY. NOTICE OF PAYMENT OF COURT ORDER OF COMMISSIONER JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER 839377707 ACCORDING TO THE COINAGE ACT OF APRIL 2, 1792, AND COMMISSIONER JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER 839377707 OATH OF STATE AND FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONS ARTICLE I, SECTION 10, CLAUSE I."

Manuel Grijalva, Paul Anthony Gosar, Andrew Steven Biggs, David S. Schweikert, Rubén Marinelarena Gallego, Debra Kay Lesko, Gregory John Stanton), Commission on Judicial Conduct Arizona, The Common Law Court International (Simon), The Common Law Court United Kingdom, The Common Law Court Australia (Mike Holt), The Common Law Court America, United Nations (The Hague, Neatherlands; International Criminal Court; Reference OTP-CR-446/21), Lisa Chaney (Expert Witness/Court Reporter Prescott Arizona, Domestic/International Media News Outlets, &c.

VERIFICATION, and CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

¶77. Based upon the Declarant, *Michael Willis* of the Chase Family, Principal Creditor for MICHAEL WILLIS CHASETM sincerely held religious education and training, Declarant knows the Word of our Creator prohibits the swearing to tell the truth by any oath or affirmation, or signing any paper "under the penalty of perjury" as these are oaths, prohibited by our Creator Holy Scriptural Law, because <u>Psalm 116:11</u> "all men are lairs" as revealed through The Creator Holy Scriptural Law. Declarant quotes the following declared evidence in our Creator Holy Scripture Law by the former tax-gather *Matthew* who was well qualified to produce evidence. He records fully the discourses of Yeshua ben Yosef and declares the following evidence: The Apostle Matthew's testimony in the King James Version: Matthew 5:33-37 "Again, ye have heard that it was to them of old time, Thou shalt not forswear thyself, but shall perform unto the Lord thine oaths: But I say unto you, SWEAR NOT AT ALL; neither by the heaven; for it is the throne of Yahweh; nor by the earth; for it is the footstool of his feet; nor by Jerusalem; for it is the city of the

Michael Willis of the Chase family – "FOR THE RECORD: DECLARED WITNESSED TESTIMONY OF MICHAEL WILLIS OF THE CHASE FAMILY. NOTICE OF PAYMENT OF COURT ORDER OF COMMISSIONER JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER 839377707 ACCORDING TO THE COINAGE ACT OF APRIL 2, 1792, AND COMMISSIONER JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER 839377707 OATH OF STATE AND FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONS ARTICLE I, SECTION 10, CLAUSE I."

great King. Neither shalt thou swear by thy head, because thou canst not make one hair white or black. But let your speech be, Yea, yea; Nay, nay; for whatsoever is more than these is of the evil one."

¶78. I, *Michael Willis* of the Chase Family, the Declarant, I Am, the identified party in the above entitled "FOR THE RECORD: DECLARED WITNESSED TESTIMONY OF *MICHAEL WILLIS* OF THE CHASE FAMILY. NOTICE OF PAYMENT OF COURT ORDER OF COMMISSIONER JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER 839377707 ACCORDING TO THE COINAGE ACT OF APRIL 2, 1792, AND COMMISSIONER JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER 839377707 OATH OF STATE AND FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONS ARTICLE I, SECTION 10, CLAUSE I." to Commissioner JOHN D. NAPPER By Asseveration, and know the contents thereof. I declare that the above is correct and certain to the best of my knowledge. I do claim all my Rights at all times, and waive none of my Rights at anytime, for any cause or reason.

¶79. *Michael Willis* of the Chase Family, Principal Creditor for MICHAEL WILLIS CHASE™ herein declares: THAT *Michael Willis* of the Chase Family is competent to state to the matters set forth herein. THAT *Michael Willis* of the Chase Family has personal knowledge of the facts stated herein. THAT all the *FACTS* stated herein are correct and certain to the best of *Michael Willis* of the Chase Family knowledge, are admissible as evidence, and if called upon as a witnesses, *Michael Willis* of the Chase Family will testify to their veracity. THAT *Michael Willis* of the Chase Family states the following facts;

¶80. Further, Declarant sets forth declared evidence in the Creator Holy Scriptural Law by the Apostle *James* who was well qualified to produce evidence: *James*, the

Michael Willis of the Chase family – "FOR THE RECORD: DECLARED WITNESSED TESTIMONY OF MICHAEL WILLIS OF THE CHASE FAMILY. NOTICE OF PAYMENT OF COURT ORDER OF COMMISSIONER JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER 839377707 ACCORDING TO THE COINAGE ACT OF APRIL 2, 1792, AND COMMISSIONER JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER 839377707 OATH OF STATE AND FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONS ARTICLE I, SECTION 10, CLAUSE I."

1	Apostle and bond-servant of YAHWEH and of Yeshua ben Yosef as witness: James
2	<u>5:12</u> ²
3	¶81. This named Declarant below does here by declare that the preceding and the
4	following statements are the facts, here by verified as he knows them, and are correct,
5	and certain to the best of his knowledge. <u>Deuteronomy 19:15</u> ³
6	
7	Dated this 11 th day of April, 2022.
8	
9	Autograph:
10	
11	In Propria Persona, Principal Creator for MICHAEL WILLIS CHASE TM , which is a Corporate Identity, a Legal Fiction in all uppercase, a decedent. All rights reserved.
12	
13	Ste Lu Mich Van V
14	Steven Lee McMillan - As Witness Paul Thorit: Agneberg - As Witness
15	I, Michael Willis of the Chase Family, do hereby certify that I hand-delivered an
16	original copy of this correct and complete autographed and sealed instrument titled,
17	"FOR THE RECORD: DECLARED WITNESSED TESTIMONY OF MICHAEL
18	WILLIS OF THE CHASE FAMILY. NOTICE OF PAYMENT OF COURT
19	ORDER OF COMMISSIONER JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER
20	839377707 ACCORDING TO THE COINAGE ACT OF APRIL 2, 1792, AND
21	COMMISSIONER JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER 839377707 OATH
22	2 James 5:12 "But above all things, my brethren, swear NOT, neither by heaven, neither by the
23	earth, nor by any this oath: but let your yea be yea; and your nay, nay; that ye fall not under judgment."
24	3 Deuteronomy 19:15 "at the mouth of two witnesses or at the mouth of three witnesses shall the matter be established"
25	maner de estadistica
26	

a

Michael Willis of the Chase family - "FOR THE RECORD: DECLARED WITNESSED TESTIMONY OF MICHAEL WILLIS OF THE CHASE FAMILY. NOTICE OF PAYMENT OF COURT ORDER OF COMMISSIONER JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER 839377707 ACCORDING TO THE COINAGE ACT OF APRIL 2, 1792, AND COMMISSIONER JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER 839377707 OATH OF STATE AND FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONS ARTICLE I, SECTION 10, CLAUSE I."

27

28

PAGE 35 OF 36

26

27

28

Michael Willis of the Chase family – "FOR THE RECORD: DECLARED WITNESSED TESTIMONY OF MICHAEL WILLIS OF THE CHASE FAMILY. NOTICE OF PAYMENT OF COURT ORDER OF COMMISSIONER JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER 839377707 ACCORDING TO THE COINAGE ACT OF APRIL 2, 1792, AND COMMISSIONER JOHN D. NAPPER D-U-N-S NUMBER 839377707 OATH OF STATE AND FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONS ARTICLE I, SECTION 10, CLAUSE I."

PAGE 36 OF 36